

Remarks

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102:

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-16, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e or a) as being anticipated by Pinchuk et al. (US 2002/0107330) ('330). Applicants previously argued that Pinchuk et al. do not teach reversibly modification of an amine because reversal of their modification does not restore the amine. The Action states that the Applicants claims do not recite that the amine is restored after reversal of the modification. Applicants have amended the claims to more explicitly recite restoration of the amines. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wolff et al. (US 20010036926). Applicants have amended the claims as described above in the response the rejection over Pinchuk et al. to obviate the rejection. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wolff et al. (US 7,087,770) ('770). Applicants have amended the claims as described above in the response the rejection over Pinchuk et al. to obviate the rejection. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103:

Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. in view of Blazyk (WO 200160162). Applicants have amended the claims as described above in the response the rejection over Pinchuk et al. to obviate the rejection. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Double Patenting:

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17 and 19-20 have been rejected of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,087,770. Applicants have amended the claims as described above in the response the rejection over Pinchuk et al. to obviate the rejection. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

The Examiner's objections and rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-7, and 10-20 should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk Ekena/  
Kirk Ekena, Reg. No. 56,672  
Mirus Bio Corporation  
505 South Rosa Road  
Madison, WI 53719  
608-238-4400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the USPTO on this date: April 21, 2008.

/Kirk Ekena/  
Kirk Ekena